IN THE HIGH COURT OF GUJARAT AT AHMEDABAD

SPECIAL CIVIL APPLICATION No 5801 of 2002

For Approval and Signature:

Hon'ble MR.JUSTICE R.P.DHOLAKIA

==========

1. Whether Reporters of Local Papers may be allowed to see the judgements? : NO

2. To be referred to the Reporter or not? : NO

3. Whether Their Lordships wish to see the fair copy of the judgement? : NO

4. Whether this case involves a substantial question of law as to the interpretation of the Constitution of India, 1950 of any Order made thereunder? : NO

5. Whether it is to be circulated to the concerned Magistrate/Magistrates,Judge/Judges,Tribunal/Tribunals? : NO

PRITESH @ LALOO MAHENDRALAL GAJJAR

Versus

STATE OF GUJARAT

Appearance:

1. Special Civil Application No. 5801 of 2002

MS BANNA DATTA ON BEHALF OF

MR AR SHAIKH for Petitioner No. 1

MS NANDINI JOSHI AGP for Respondent No. 1-3

CORAM : MR.JUSTICE R.P.DHOLAKIA

Date of decision: 29/08/2002

ORAL JUDGEMENT

The present petition has been filed by the petitioner - detenu challenging the detention order

passed by the detaining authority. The detenu has been detained under the provisions of Gujarat Prevention of Anti-Social Activities Act, 1985 (hereinafter referred to as `the Act of 1985') by order dated 10/4/2002 passed by the Police Commissioner, Ahmedabad City and he been declared as bootlegger.

2. It is now well settled that unless the activities of a person as bootlegger has disturbed the maintenance of public order, he cannot be detained under the Act. Reliance is placed on a decision in the case of Piyush Kantilal Mehta Vs. Commissioner of Police, Ahmedabad & Ors. reported in AIR 1989 SC 491.

3. I have heard learned advocate for the petitioner and also perused the material on record. According to learned advocate for the petitioner, the detaining authority has passed the detention order relying upon the solitary offence registered against the petitioner before the D.C.B. Police Station, vide CR No.5200 of 2002 for the offences punishable under Sections 66(1)(B), 65(E) and 81 of Prohibition Act on 5/4/2002 and has also relied upon statement of witnesses. The learned advocate for the petitioner has mainly argued that the petitioner has made a representation to the detaining authority on 5/6/2002 and the same has been received by the said authority, and the said representation of the petitioner has been rejected on 13/6/2002 and the petitioner was informed regarding said decision and the petitioner received the said communication on 1/7/2002 and hence The learned advocate for the petitioner tenders the copy of the said communication received by the petitioner through jail. The same is ordered to be taken on record.
According to the learned advocate for the petitioner there is a delay in considering the representation and also there is also a delay in communicating the said decision of the representation to the petitioner, which is unconstitutional. In support of her say, the learned advocate for the petitioner has placed reliance upon the decision of the Hon'ble Supreme Court reported in AIR 1981 SC 1126, in which the Honourable Supreme Court has held as under :-

> "We would emphasise that it is the duty of the State to proceed to determine representations of the character above mentioned with the utmost expedition, which means that the matter must be taken up for consideration as soon as such a representation is received and dealt with continuously (unless it is absolutely necessary to wait for some assistance in connection with

it) until a final decision is taken and communicated to the detenu. This not having been done in the present case we have no option but to declare the detention unconstitutional. We order accordingly, allow the appeal and direct that the appellant be set at liberty forthwith."

4. Since the detaining authority has not decided the representation of the petitioner and not communicated the decision of the representation of the petitioner promptly, in view of the above judgment relied upon by the learned advocate for the petitioner, the order of detention is illegal and the same cannot be sustained. Learned advocate for the petitioner does not press any other points.

5. In view of the above, the petition is allowed. The order of detention dated 10/4/2002 passed against the detenu is hereby quashed and set aside. The detenu namely Pritesh alias Laloo Mahendralal Gajjar is ordered to be set at liberty forthwith, if not required in any other case. Rule is made absolute accordingly with no order as to costs. D.S. Permitted.

(R.P.DHOLAKIA,J.)

Rafik